

# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 September 2022

**by C J Leigh BSc(Hons) MPhil MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 21 October 2022**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/L5240/D/22/3298642**  
**482 Wickham Road, Croydon, CR0 8DJ**

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
  - The appeal is made by Jack Collier against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Croydon.
  - The application Ref 21/05810/HSE, dated 19 November 2021, was refused by notice dated 23 March 2022.
  - The development proposed is a first floor rear extension.
- 

## Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

## Main issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development on, firstly, the character and appearance of the surrounding area and, secondly, the living conditions of adjoining occupants.

## Reasons

### *Character and appearance*

3. Wickham Road sees detached and semi-detached houses and bungalows fronting the road in a consistent fashion. There is good spacing between properties at first floor, with a regular form to the housing that aids the impression of consistency in the streetscene.
  4. The proposed extension would be on top of the existing single storey rear extension. As a result of following the form and location of that extension, the addition would be set behind the main house but project either side of the existing building, particularly to the western side. This would create a house of odd proportions, where the two-storey extension would appear as a clear later add-on that has little relationship to the original property: two deeply set-back, imbalanced 'wings' would be seen that project away from the existing side elevations of the house, with a depth and roof form that would emphasize the discordance with the original house.
  5. There would be clear views of this addition, particularly from the west due to the appeal property being set forward from its neighbour at No. 480 and the large gap to that neighbour at first floor. The design, scale and form of the
-

extension would therefore be disruptive to the appearance and form of the existing house and the character of the wider area.

6. On the first issue it is therefore concluded that the proposed development would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area. This would conflict with Policies DM10 and SP4 of the Croydon Local Plan 2018 which, amongst other matters, seek to ensure a high-quality built environment and that new development is of a high standard of design appropriate to the local character of an area; and Policies D3 and D4 of the London Plan 2021 that seeks a design-led approach to development to deliver design quality. The proposals would also not be consistent with the Council's Suburban Design Guide 2019 Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) which requires extensions and alterations to respond to the character of the area.

#### *Living conditions*

7. The adjoining property to the west at No. 480 is set deeper into its garden than the appeal property. The proposed extension would adjoin the main two storey element of No. 480 and there is a sizeable gap from No. 480 to the mutual boundary. For these reasons there would not be any overbearing effect on No. 480 or likely effect on levels of light.
8. The relationship between the appeal property and No. 484 to the east is different. No. 484 is set notably closer to the mutual boundary with the appeal property and, unlike No. 480, has a broadly similar rear building line. The proposed first floor extension would sit close to the rearward projection of the existing ground floor addition to No. 484, and this fact would mitigate any overbearing effect from the ground floor or garden of that property.
9. However, the proposals would result in a new first floor in close position to the boundary with No. 484 and I am concerned regarding the depth and proximity of this extension as it relates to the first-floor rear window of No. 484. In my judgement from the site visit, that proximity is likely to have an adverse effect on outlook and the levels of light, given the south-facing location of the window and the extension's position to the south west.
10. There is little objective evidence on this matter that reassures me reasonable levels of light would be retained. Thus, based on what I have read and seen; I must conclude on the second issue that there would be harm to the living conditions of adjoining occupiers at No. 484. This would be contrary to Policy DM10 of the Local Plan and Policy D6 of the London Plan which, amongst other matters, support proposals for development that ensure the amenities of the occupiers of adjoining buildings are protected, and similar objectives in the SPD that require extensions to properties to avoid negatively impacting neighbouring properties.

#### *Conclusions*

11. I acknowledge the appellant's wish to extend and alter their property, and that changes have occurred to houses in the wider area. I also note that there have not been any objections to the proposals from neighbouring residents. However, the London Plan, the Council's adopted local plan and the SPD set out the requirements against which proposals must be appraised and, for the

reasons given, I concur that the scheme does not satisfy the development plan as a whole. The appeal is therefore dismissed.

*C J Leigh*

INSPECTOR